

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 28-59 are active in the present application. Claims 28-51 and 53 are amended and Claims 54-59 are added by the present amendment.

Amendments to the claims find support in the specification as originally filed, at least at page 8, line 20 through page 9, line 20, and page 26, lines 3-10. New Claims 54-59 find support at least at page 23, lines 9-16, page 34, lines 11-17, and page 43, lines 10-14. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 28-34, 36-45, and 47-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,976,210 to Silva et al. (herein “Silva”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,448 to Brown et al. (herein “Brown”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,669,005 to Curbow et al. (herein “Curbow”); Claims 35 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Silva in view of Brown, Curbow and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0024536 to Kahan.

Initially, Applicant gratefully acknowledge the courtesy of a personal interview with Applicant’s representative, Examiner Blackwell, and Supervisory Patent Examiner Hutton on October 31, 2006. During the interview, differences between the claimed inventions and references in the Office Action were discussed. In addition, claim amendments were discussed to more clearly distinguish the claims over the references in the Office Action. Comments and claim amendments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 28-34, 36-45, and 47-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Silva, Brown, and Curbow, with respect to amended independent Claims 28, 40, and 53.

Amended Claim 28 is directed to a document editing method that includes, in part, reading a first structured document, determining type information associated with the first structured document, and determining whether the first structured document is a block document that includes tag information for specifying partial documents that correspond to operation units on which a selected operation may be performed. The method also includes converting the first structured document into the block document, displaying the first structured document, preparing parts data associated with the first structured document, storing the first structured document, and editing the first structured document by updating the parts data corresponding to the partial documents in accordance with the selected operation. Independent Claims 40 and 53 include similar features.

As discussed during the interview, a document editing method according to Claim 28 may advantageously include a block document having partial documents that correspond to operation units identified by a web operator or a web page developer such that selected operations may be performed on the operation units, thereby simplifying the task of a user and preserving a structure imposed by the web operator or web page developer.

On the other hand, the references in the outstanding Office Action, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the features of the claimed inventions. For example, Silva, Brown, and Curbow fail to teach or suggest any block document that includes tag information for specifying partial documents that correspond to operation units on which a selected operation may be performed. Silva indicates that “essentially any web page can be selected by a user to be a web clipping component of the personalized web view.... The user accesses the source web page of his interest, extracts those elements within the source page that he wants included within the clipping, defines a

layout of such information content within the clipping.”<sup>1</sup> However, Silva fails to teach or suggest any operation units in a web page on which a selected operation may be performed.

Similarly, Brown describes a composite web page built from any web content.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Brown fails to teach or suggest a method that determines whether a first structured document is a block document that includes tag information for specifying partial documents that correspond to operation units on which a selected operation may be performed. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Curbow also fails to teach or suggest the claimed features lacking in the disclosure of Silva and Brown. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Silva, Brown, and Curbow fail to teach or suggest a document editing method that includes “determining whether the first structured document is a block document that includes tag information for specifying partial documents that correspond to operation units on which a selected operation may be performed,” as recited in Claim 28, and as similarly recited in Claims 40 and 53.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 28, 40, and 53, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Silva, Brown, and Curbow.

In addition, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 35 and 46 as unpatentable over Silva, Brown, Curbow, and Kahan.

Claims 35 and 46 depend from independent Claims 28 and 40, respectively, which patentably define over Silva, Brown, and Curbow, as discussed above. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Kahan also fails to teach or suggest the claimed features lacking in the disclosures of Silva, Brown, and Curbow. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that rejection be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 28, 40, and 53, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

---


<sup>1</sup> Silva at column 1, lines 56-62.

<sup>2</sup> Brown at Title.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Zachary S. Stern  
Registration No. 54,719

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK:ZSS\rle

I:\ATTY\ZS\23'S\239\239875US\239875us-AM2.DOC